

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

Barbara Desselle,

Plaintiff,

V.

Bluestem Brands, Inc. d/b/a Fingerhut,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.: 5:12-cv-00914

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Barbara Desselle, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of the Defendant's repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of the Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendant and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Barbara Desselle (“Plaintiff”), is an adult individual residing in San Antonio, Texas, and is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. The Defendant, Bluestem Brands, Inc. d/b/a Fingerhut (“Bluestem”), is a Delaware business entity with an address of 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

6. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$500.00 (the “Debt”) to Fingerhut (the “Creditor”).

7. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

8. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Bluestem for collection, or Bluestem was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

9. The Defendant attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Bluestem Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

10. Within the last year, Defendant placed numerous calls daily to Plaintiff's cellular phone.

11. Nearly every call from Defendant has been placed using an automated telephone dialer system with an artificial or prerecorded voice (hereafter "Robocalls").

12. Plaintiff received a voice message from a live reprehensive from Defendant on only one occasion.

13. When Plaintiff picked up Defendant's Robocalls, the line was always silent.

14. On August 14, 2012, Plaintiff called Defendant and spoke with Missy, a representative with Defendant. Plaintiff requested that Defendant cease calling her regarding the Debt. Missy responded that she would make a note on Plaintiff's file and stop calling Plaintiff.

15. Despite this conversation, Defendant continued its calling campaign to collect the Debt.

16. After the conversation on August 14, 2012, Defendant's Robocalls resumed at such a rate that Plaintiff received eight Robocalls a day on her cellular phone.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

17. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendant's unlawful conduct.

18. As a direct consequence of the Defendant's acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

19. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

20. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendant engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

21. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendant caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

22. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

23. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendant used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.

24. The Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11) in that Defendant failed to inform the consumer that the communication was an attempt to collect a debt.

25. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

26. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE TEXAS DEBT COLLECTION ACT
TEX. FIN. CODE ANN. § 392, et al.

27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

28. The Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(1).

29. The Defendant is each a “debt collector” and a “third party debt collector” as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(6) and (7).

30. The Defendant called the Plaintiff and failed to identify the name of the debt collection agency or the individual debt collector, with the intent to annoy and harass, in violation of Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.302(2).

31. The Defendant caused a telephone to ring repeatedly, with the intent to annoy or abuse the Plaintiff, in violation of Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.302(4).

32. The Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief and actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1) and (2) and to remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a).

COUNT III
VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT –
47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

33. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

34. Without prior consent the Defendant contacted the Plaintiff by means of automatic telephone calls or prerecorded messages at a cellular telephone or pager in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

35. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

36. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendant’s violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the

Defendant:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendant;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendant;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendant;
4. Injunctive relief pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1);
5. Actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(2);
6. Remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a);
7. Statutory damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) & (C);
8. Actual damages from the Defendant for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations;
9. Punitive damages; and
10. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: September 27, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg, *Attorney-in-Charge*
Connecticut Bar No. 425027
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
E-mail: slemberg@lemborglaw.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff